



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/517,513 | 12/09/2004 | Jerome Tjia | SG02 0013 US | 7123 |
| 65913 | 7590 | 09/06/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| NXP, B.V. | | | PHAN, RAYMOND NGAN | |
| NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT | | | | |
| M/S41-SJ | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1109 MCKAY DRIVE | | | 2111 | |
| SAN JOSE, CA 95131 | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/06/2007 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | 10/517,513 | TJIA ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Raymond Phan | 2111 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: the Appeal Brief filed on May 17, 2007.
2. This application has been examined. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 (page 14, lines 16-17), claim 8 (page 15, line 31-32), claim 15 (page 17, lines 6-7), the claim language, “said translator being operable to transmit said request in said second format to said second station”, is vague and not functionally clear. As best understood, the translator is not able to transmit the request/signal. Technically, the functionality of the *translator* is *operable to translate* the signal or data. According to the USB specification, a transaction translator is operable to translate the USB full/low-speed signal/data into the USB high-speed signal/data. Applicants are request to provide technical support how the translator is operable to transmit the signal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Change et al. (US No. 6,775,733) in view of Szabelski (US No. 6,959,355).

In regard to claims 1, 8, 15, Chang et al. disclose a bus system comprising a

first station 104 and a second station 126 coupled by a bus (i.e. USB) for transferring signals (see figure 5, col. 3, lines 9-30), said bus being arranged to operate according to a protocol in which said first station repeatedly sends requests for data to said second station, said protocol comprising a first mode (i.e. high speed) for transferring said requests in a first request format (i.e. EHCI 150) at a first communication speed (i.e. high speed) and at least a second mode (full or low speed) for transferring said requests in a second request format (i.e. OHCI) at a second speed (i.e. full or low speed) (see figure 5), said second station being arranged to receive requests in a mode selected from a group of modes comprising said first and second modes, and being arranged to give a first indication to said first station if it is being arranged to operate according to said first mode (see col. 4, lines 15-36) and a second indication if it is being arranged to operate according to said second mode (see col. 4, lines 15-36), characterized in that said first station comprises a processor (142 or 146), a controller (152 or 150), said processor being operable to generate request properties for requests in said first request format, said controller being operable to generate said requests in said first request format from said request properties, further being operable to transmit said request in said first format (i.e. USB2.0 or USB1.1) to said second station upon detection of said first indication (i.e. USB2.0 or USB1.1). But Chang et al. do not specifically disclose the translator in the OHCI and to forward said request to said translator upon detection of said second indication (i.e. USB2.0 or USB1.1), and said translator being operable to translate said request in said second format (i.e. USB1.1) to said second station (see figure 5, col. 4, lines 15-36). However Szabelski discloses the transaction translator 20 and the request is forward to said translator upon detection of said second indication (i.e. full/low speed), and said translator being operable to

translate said request in said second format (i.e. high-speed) to said second station (see figure 2A, col. 3, lines 25-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Szabelski within the OHCI of Chang et al. because it would provide simultaneous transfers used in a system with a high-speed bus.

In regard to claims 2, 9, 16, Chang et al. disclose wherein said bus system is a USB system (see figure 3, col. 1, lines 43-64).

In regard to claims 3, 10, 17, Chang et al. disclose wherein said request properties comprise mode information whereby said controller is operable to determine from said mode information if said request is to be transmitted in said first or second format, respectively (see col. 4, lines 15-36).

In regard to claims 4, 11, 18, Szabelski discloses wherein said second station is assigned an address, said request properties comprise address information whereby said controller is operable to determine from said address information if said request is to be transmitted in said first or second format, respectively (see col. 5, lines 43-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Szabelski within the system of Chang et al. because it would provide simultaneous transfers used in a system with a high-speed bus.

In regard to claims 5, 12, 19, Chang et al. disclose in that said first station also comprises a router 160 for routing said requests transmitted in said first and second modes by said controller and said translator, respectively, to said bus (see figure 5, col. 4, lines 15-36).

In regard to claims 6, 13, 20, Chang et al. disclose in that said first mode is also conceived for transferring responses in a first response format at said first

communication speed and said second mode is also conceived for transferring said responses in a second response format at said second speed, said second station is operable to transmit responses to said first station in a mode selected from a group of modes comprising said first and second modes (see col. 4, lines 15-36). But Chang et al. do not disclose said translator is operable to receive said responses in said second response format and to forward said responses to said controller, said controller is operable to receive said responses in said first response format and to generate response properties from said responses in said first response format, and said processor is operable to handle said response properties generated by said controller. However Szabelski discloses the transaction translator 20 and the request is forward to said translator upon detection of said second indication (i.e. full/low speed), and said translator being operable to translate said request in said second format (i.e. high-speed) to said second station (see figure 2A, col. 3, lines 25-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Szabelski within the OHCI of Chang et al. because it would provide simultaneous transfers used in a system with a high-speed bus.

In regard to claims 7, 14, 21, Chang et al. disclose in that said first station also comprises a router 160 for routing said responses transmitted by said second station to said translator and to said controller, whereby said router is operable to route said responses to said controller upon detection of said first indication and to said translator upon detection of said second indication (see figure 5, col. 4, lines 15-36).

Response to Amendment

5. Since this application is eligible for the transitional procedure of 37 CFR 1.129(a), and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(r) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action is hereby withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(a). Applicant's response submission after final filed on May 17, 2007 has been entered.
6. Applicant's arguments from Appeal Brief, see pages 10-12, filed on May 17, 2007, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-21 under 35 USC 102/103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Szabelski.

Conclusion

7. All claims are rejected.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM. The Group Fax No. (571) 273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 central telephone number is (571) 272-2100.



Raymond Phan
Patent Examiner
Tech Center 2100